2006 ATLANTA REGION VANPOOL RIDER SURVEY

OCTOBER 2006

PREPARED FOR:
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PREPARED BY:
CENTER FOR TRANSPORTATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT

IN ASSOCIATION WITH

LDA CONSULTING
AND
CIC RESEARCH, INC.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS ..... **I**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ..... **III**

INTRODUCTION III
PROGRAM IMPACTS III
Commuter Placements and Placement Rates ..... *iii*
Vehicle Trips and VMT Reduced ..... *iii*
Emissions Reduced ..... *iv*
KEY SURVEY RESULTS IV
CONCLUSIONS V
RECOMMENDATIONS VI

SECTION 1 OVERVIEW **1**

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT 1
ORGANIZATION OF REPORT 1

SECTION 2 DATA COLLECTION **2**

QUESTIONNAIRE DEVELOPMENT 2
SAMPLE PREPARATION 2
SURVEY PRE-TEST 2
SURVEY DISTRIBUTION AND COLLECTION 2

SECTION 3 SURVEY RESULTS **4**

CURRENT COMMUTE MODE 4
Current Commute Mode Split By Weekly Trips *4*
CURRENT TRAVEL PATTERNS 5
Distance and Time from Home to Work *5*
Means of Traveling to Vanpool Meeting Location *6*
Distance to Vanpool *6*
Length of Time Vanpooling *7*
Makeup of Vanpool *7*
MODE CHANGES 7
Commute Mode Prior to Vanpooling *7*
FACTORS THAT INFLUENCED COMMUTERS TO JOIN A VANPOOL 7
INFORMATION OR SERVICES TO ASSIST IN FINDING OR FORMING A VANPOOL 8
FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE 9
Commuters or Vanpools Receiving Financial Assistance *9*
Organizations Providing Financial Assistance *9*
Use of Vanpool Prior to Receipt of Financial Assistance *9*
Importance of Financial Assistance in Decision to Vanpool *9*
Alternate Transportation Mode if Vanpooling not an Option *10*
VANPOOL EXPERIENCE 10
Participation in Regional Incentive Program *10*
Vanpool Drivers *11*
Challenging Factors *11*
Satisfaction with Assistance in Forming, Joining or Operating a Vanpool *11*
Satisfaction with Available Services *12*
Other Services *13*
Interest in Minivans *13*
Improving the Vanpool Experience *14*
DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE 18
Gender and Age *18*
Ethnic Background *18*
Income *18*

SECTION 4 IMPACTS OF COMMUTE CHANGES 20

PROGRAM IMPACT MEASURES 20

Commuter Placements and Placement Rates 20

Vehicle Trips and VMT Reduced 21

Emissions Reduced 21

SECTION 5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 23

CONCLUSIONS 23

RECOMMENDATIONS 23

APPENDIX A FINAL SURVEY 25

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The Center for Transportation and the Environment (CTE), on behalf of the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT), conducted a survey of vanpool riders in the metropolitan Atlanta region in May 2006. Employer Service Organizations (ESOs) and the four vanpool vendors in the region—Georgia Regional Transportation Authority (GRTA), Douglas County Rideshare, VPSI, and Enterprise—assisted with identification of the riders.

The objectives of the survey included:

- Collecting data to use in calculating travel and air quality emission reductions for vanpool drivers and riders served by GRTA, Douglas County Rideshare, VPSI, and Enterprise
- Examining the role incentives play in a vanpool driver or riders decision to vanpool
- Collecting demographic data for GRTA in preparation for the authority's triennial review with Federal Transit Administration (FTA)
- Gauging rider satisfaction with overall vanpool experience

The survey is part of a broad evaluation program lead by GDOT, and in cooperation with the Federal Highway Administration, to evaluate the effectiveness of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs receiving Congestion and Air Quality Mitigation Improvement (CMAQ) funds. Vanpool related activities are one of several TDM programs offered by ESOs and vanpool vendors across the Atlanta region receiving CMAQ funds.

PROGRAM IMPACTS

The travel and air quality emissions reductions achieved by the use of vanpools as a commute option are included in Table A. These impacts only include the contributions of those vanpooling at the time of the survey. The impacts are expected to increase by the end of the year due to the growth in vanpooling in the region. CTE will determine the travel and air quality emissions reductions achieved for the 2006 calendar year in early 2007, when the 2006 final vanpool counts are available.

Commuter Placements and Placement Rates

Based on data from vendor records and data from the survey, an estimated 2,800 individuals commute to and from work in a vanpool operated by one of the four vendors. The new placement rate shown in Table A reflects the percentage of commuters who started vanpooling during the year prior to the survey. The retained placement rate reflects the percentage of commuters who started vanpooling more than one year prior to the survey.

Vehicle Trips and VMT Reduced

Vehicle trip reduction measures the number of vehicle trips no longer made as a result of commuters shifting to alternative modes. An examination of the travel behavior reported by survey respondents yields a vehicle trip reduction (VTR) factor of -1.42 daily one-way vehicle trips reduced per placement.

This factor, when multiplied by the number of placements in vanpools, equals a total daily vehicle trip reduction of 3,976 trips. Multiplying the number of vehicle trips reduced by the average commute distance for the respondents who vanpool results in a total daily vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction of 149,895 miles.

TABLE A: VANPOOL RIDER PROGRAM IMPACT MEASURES

Impact Measure	Daily Impacts
Placement Rates	
- New vanpool placement rate	50.6%
- Retained vanpool placement rate	49.4%
Commuter Placements	
- New vanpool placements	1,417
- Retained vanpool placements	1,383
Daily Vehicle Trips Reduced	
- New vanpool placements	2,012
- Retained vanpool placements	1,964
Daily VMT Reduced	
- New vanpool placements	75,847
- Retained vanpool placements	74,048
Daily Emissions Reduced*	
- NO_x (tons)	0.1167
- VOC (tons)	0.1396

**Daily emissions reduced are based on the 2005 regional emission factors provided by the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Protection Division. Emission factors for 2006 will be available in early 2007 and these factors will be updated at that time.*

Emissions Reduced

Emissions benefits, defined as tons of pollutants reduced, are calculated by multiplying regional emission factors provided by the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Georgia Environmental Protection Division by the amount of VMT reduced. Twenty counties in the metropolitan Atlanta region do not meet federal air quality standards for ozone. Reducing emissions of oxides of Nitrogen (NO_x) and Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) is of particular concern in the region as these pollutants are the primary components in the formation of ozone. The emissions reduced equal:

- NOx 0.1167 tons per day reduced
- VOC 0.1396 tons per day reduced

} 0.2563 tons pollutants per day reduced

KEY SURVEY RESULTS

- As expected, vanpooling is the most prevalent commute mode among survey respondents (94.1%). Prior to vanpooling, 77.6% of respondents usually drove alone to work.

- On average, vanpool riders, commute 37.7 miles each way, have been participating in a vanpool 34 months (almost three years), and ride in a vanpool with 9.6 persons.

- If vanpooling were not available, vanpool riders would most likely drive alone (78.1%), carpool (35.2%), or ride a bus/train (21.7%).

- Two-thirds (65.9%) of the vanpool riders who receive financial assistance said the assistance was very important in their decision to vanpool. Likewise, nearly 60% said they did not vanpool prior to receiving financial assistance.

- The majority of survey respondents said gas savings (94.1%), reducing wear and tear on a personal vehicle (88.9%), and reducing commute stress (72.9%) were the factors that most influenced them to join a vanpool.

- Survey respondents validated ESO opinions on the most challenging aspects of vanpooling, including balancing rider needs (28.7%), recruiting back-up drivers (28.1%), juggling schedules (26.8%), and obtaining new riders (26.7%).

- Less than 30% of vanpool riders said they participate in Commuter Rewards and less than 25% were aware of the Vanpool Incentive Program New Rider Referral.

CONCLUSIONS

Vanpooling is the only commute alternative option the majority of vanpool rider survey respondents would use. Slightly more than 78% replied they would drive alone to work if vanpooling was not available. In addition, the vanpoolers surveyed show a strong commitment to vanpooling. Nearly 95% of weekly commute trips for those surveyed are made in a vanpool, increasing from 85.3% of weekly commute trips in 2002. By vanpooling, the respondents reduce nearly 4,000 trips daily. The respondents also are long-time users of the mode. On average they began vanpooling nearly three years ago.

The nearly 150,000 daily vehicle miles reduced as a result of vanpool activity is particularly significant due to the lengths of the vanpoolers' commutes. On average, the one-way commute distance is 37.7 miles. The reduction in vehicle miles traveled result in significant daily air pollution emissions reductions, approximately 0.2563 tons per day for NO_x and VOC combined.

Financial incentives are an important component in prompting commuters to vanpool. More than one-half of the respondents participate in a vanpool that receives financial assistance for all or part of the vanpool operation. More than one-half also stated they did not vanpool prior to receiving the assistance.

Vanpoolers tend to be satisfied with their overall vanpool experience and the services provided. While many respondents provided suggestions on how to improve their vanpool experience, there was a not preponderance of support for any one issue or concern.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The survey findings clearly show the substantial contributions vanpoolers make in trip and vehicle miles reduced, and ultimately, emissions reductions for TDM programs within the Atlanta region. The survey findings also reveal a successful regional vanpool program and validate the importance of vanpooling in the region. Survey questions about the role incentives play in a commuter's choice to start or continue vanpooling show a positive correlation between the availability of incentives and the choice to vanpool. Responses to further questions regarding the overall vanpool experience also provide insight to vanpoolers' behavior and motivations. These findings suggest several actions the TDM community should take to maintain and even improve vanpooling successes in the region.

- The large number of vanpool riders who would switch back to driving alone if vanpooling was not available would have a substantial impact on vehicle miles traveled and air quality emissions reductions provided by TDM programs. **As such, the TDM community should continue to support new vanpool formation and maintenance of existing vanpools. Particular attention should be given to maintaining ridership on existing vans by providing assistance in replacing riders who leave vanpools and identifying riders for empty seats on existing vans**, as some vanpool riders cited obtaining new riders as a challenging aspect of participating in a vanpool.

- The nearly two-thirds of vanpool riders who said financial assistance was "very important" to their decision to start or continue to vanpool demonstrates a continued need to financially support vanpool programs in the region. More importantly, over half did not vanpool prior to receiving this assistance, signifying the power of incentives in encouraging participation. **GRTA should continue to focus on securing long-term 5307 finding for the regional vanpool program and CMAQ should continue to be used to the maximum extent possible within federal guidelines. ESOs wishing to use local funds to further subsidize vanpooling within the parameters of a regional program should work to identify sustainable funding resources. Other incentives not requiring direct funding that would help reduce costs of vanpooling, such as certain tax incentives, should also be explored.**

- The recent growth in vanpools across the region and the positive survey findings related to the financial assistance provided is a good indication that the portfolio of vanpool incentives provided by the TDM community is meeting the needs of vanpool riders. However, many vanpool riders did express concern with the ability to identify drivers and some suggested offering additional incentives to assist with vanpool driver recruitment. **The TDM community should consider making the driver incentive a routinely offered incentive and investigate the feasibility of additional incentives to encourage participants to become drivers or back-up drivers.**

- The low level of awareness among vanpool riders for Commuter Rewards and the Vanpool Incentive Program New Rider Referral illustrates a need to raise rider awareness of the various regional incentive programs available to them. The lack of awareness is

also supported by vanpool rider suggestions to provide information for all programs and general lack of awareness of existing programs. **The TDM community should make a concerted effort to increase vanpool rider awareness and understanding of the various regional incentive programs available to them.**

- **When conveying the benefits of vanpooling to potential riders, gas savings, reduced wear and tear on a personal vehicle, and reduced commute stress should be part of the overall marketing and outreach message.** These benefits are the factors vanpool riders cited as top influences in their decision to vanpool and also validate focus group work completed by The Clean Air Campaign earlier this year.

SECTION 1 OVERVIEW

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to document the findings from the 2006 Atlanta Region Vanpool Rider Survey. The primary purpose of the survey was to collect data to estimate the travel and air quality emissions benefits resulting from vanpool activities of the four primary Atlanta vanpool vendors serving the Atlanta region. This report presents data on current and past commute behavior of vanpoolers and the impact of financial incentives on vanpool formation and maintenance. In this regard, the 2006 survey is consistent with the survey of vanpool riders conducted by the Center for Transportation and the Environment (CTE) in November 2002. Unlike the 2002 survey, this survey included questions added at the request of the region's Employer Services Organizations (ESOs) to gauge the overall satisfaction with the vanpool experience. This survey also collected demographic data that Georgia Regional Transportation Authority (GRTA) used in the authority's triennial review with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA).

The individuals surveyed participate in a vanpool through one of four vendors providing vanpool services in the Atlanta region. The vendors include GRTA, Douglas County Rideshare, VPSI, and Enterprise. An estimated 3,168 potential respondents received the survey. A total of 1,019 vanpool riders either completed surveys on-line or returned completed surveys via the mail, for a survey response rate of 32%.

As mentioned, the survey focused on vanpool riders participating in vanpools operated by one of the four vendors listed above. There are vanpools operating in the region outside of these vendors and the contributions of these vanpools are not reflected in the results presented in this report.

ORGANIZATION OF REPORT

The report is divided into five sections.

Section 1 – Purpose and organization of the report
Section 2 – Description of the survey and sampling methodology
Section 3 – Results of the survey
Section 4 – Impacts of commute changes
Section 5 - Conclusions and recommendations

The report also includes appendices with the final survey instrument and the detailed impact calculation spreadsheets.

SECTION 2 DATA COLLECTION

This section briefly describes the 2006 Atlanta Region Vanpool Rider Survey methodology.

QUESTIONNAIRE DEVELOPMENT

The survey was developed by CTE with input from the TDM Policy Group and the ESOs. The survey was designed for self-administration and included cover letters for both vanpool drivers and riders. The letters explained the purpose of the survey and instructed respondents on the options for returning completed surveys.

SAMPLE PREPARATION

Potential survey respondents included all vanpool riders participating in a vanpool operated by one of the four Atlanta vendors as of March 31, 2006. Included in the sample were Douglas County Rideshare (35 vans), GRTA (52 vans), VPSI (180 vans), and Enterprise (10 vans). Two of the vendors—GRTA and Enterprise—provided the actual number of riders in their vans. CTE based the number of Douglas County riders on an estimate provided by the vendor of 12 riders per van. One employer supporting 65 vanpools through VPSI provided actual ridership numbers for these vans. CTE based the ridership on the remaining 115 vans in the VPSI fleet on van size of either nine or 15 passengers. This resulted in an estimate of 3,443 riders on 277 vans.

In summary, the total number of riders estimated in the vanpool rider population is based on the actual number of riders reported by the four vendors in combination with an estimate of riders based on van capacity. This results in an estimated number of riders that exceeds the actual number of riders since not all vendors provided an exact ridership numbers for each of the vans they operate. The estimated number of riders in the vanpool rider population is used to determine response rate for the survey. A more accurate number of riders based on responses given in the survey and actual rider data provided by the vendors is used to calculate the impacts found later in this report.

Individual vanpools operating outside of the four vendors were not included in the study. The sampling plan included all vanpool riders identified in the study.

SURVEY PRE-TEST

One GRTA van participated in the survey pre-test. Riders completed the survey during the week of April 24, 2006. The results of the pre-test did not show the need to make any changes to the survey instrument.

SURVEY DISTRIBUTION AND COLLECTION

With assistance from the vendors, CTE distributed survey packages to vanpool drivers. The packages included a letter to the vanpool driver asking for assistance with the distribution of the surveys to the riders in their van. The packages also contained an envelope for each rider in the vanpool. These envelopes included a cover letter to each vanpool rider explaining the survey and a postage-paid reply envelope. Respondents had the option of completing the paper survey and

returning it by mail or visiting a web link referenced in the cover letter to complete the survey online.

Representatives from GRTA, Douglas County, and Enterprise hand delivered driver packages to their respective vans from late May through early June. Driver packages were mailed directly to VPSI drivers in late May.

After the questionnaire was approved and distributed, one employer expressed concerns about several questions on the survey. Efforts to resolve the issues concerning the questions were not successful and riders from some vans sponsored by the employer did not have access to the survey. As a result, the overall potential pool of survey respondents did not include the riders in these vans. However, a number of riders from the company did receive, complete, and return the survey. The ridership for vans from this employer completing the survey totaled 37 vans with 435 riders and is included in the survey results presented in this report.

Excluding vans that were not allowed to participate in the survey, the revised vanpool rider population for the 2006 survey includes a total of 249 vans with an estimated vanpool rider population of 3,168 riders. A total of 1,019 vanpool riders either returned the paper survey (763) or completed the survey online (256), a 32% response rate. Using the population correction factor for small populations, the confidence level for the study is 95% +/-2.5%.

SECTION 3 SURVEY RESULTS

The survey, which is similar to the vanpool survey CTE conducted for the region in 2002, collected the following data from each survey respondent:

- Current and past commute modes
- Commute characteristics (commute distance and travel time, vanpool occupancy, vanpool access meeting point, mode of travel an distance to access meeting point)
- Role of financial assistance
- Commute mode if did not vanpool

The 2006 survey also included questions to gather the following information:

- Demographic data
- Gauge rider satisfaction with the overall vanpool experience (added at request of ESOs)

Survey results presented in the tables below show respondent percentages. Most tables also show the raw number of respondents (e.g., n=1019). The margin of error for the questions answered by the full sample of recipients who returned the survey (1,019) using the population correction factor for small populations yields a confidence level of 95% +/-2.5%. Where applicable, results from the 2002 vanpool survey are also included.

CURRENT COMMUTE MODE

Current Commute Mode Split By Weekly Trips

The survey asked respondents what modes they used to travel to work Monday through Friday of the previous week. Table 1 summarizes the current mode split as the percentage of weekly trips made for all, with telework and compressed schedules included as "modes." As expected, the majority of vanpoolers weekly commute trips are made vanpooling. In comparing the 2002 and 2006 survey findings, vanpool riders are making a larger proportion of their trips vanpooling now (85.3% in 2002 survey compared to 94.1% in 2006 survey).

TABLE 1: COMMUTE MODE SPLIT BY WEEKLY TRIPS

Commute Mode	2006 Survey	2002 Survey
	Mode as Percentage of Weekly Trips	Mode as Percentage of Weekly Trips
Drive alone	3.2%	9.4%
Carpool	0.9%	2.6%
Vanpool	94.1%	85.3%
Bus	0.2%	0.4%
Train	0.0%	0.0%
Bike/walk	0.0%	0.0%
Telework	1.4%	1.7%
Compressed Work Week	0.1%	0.6%

CURRENT TRAVEL PATTERNS

Distance and Time from Home to Work

Table 2 shows the distance vanpool riders report traveling from home to work and Table 3 shows the amount of time it takes. On average, vanpool riders travel 37.7 miles from their home to their work location and their trip takes an average of 54.8 minutes. The average commute distance is consistent with 2002 survey findings, when riders reported an average commute distance of 35.2 miles with an average time of 49.3 minutes.

TABLE 2: DISTANCE FROM HOME TO WORK

Distance	Percent (n = 1,005)
20 miles or less	4.3%
21 – 30 miles	28.6%
31 – 40 miles	37.0%
41 – 50 miles	17.5%
51 – 60 miles	7.1%
61- 70 miles	3.7%
More than 70 miles	1.9%
Average Distance	**37.7 miles**

TABLE 3: TIME FROM HOME TO WORK

Time	Percent (n = 955)
15 minutes or less	0.2%
16 – 30 minutes	5.5%
31 – 45 minutes	34.5%
46 – 60 minutes	37.4%
61 minutes or more	22.4%
Average Time	**54.8 minutes**

Means of Traveling to Vanpool Meeting Location

The majority of respondents (84.9%) drove alone to a central vanpool meeting location; 5.5% leave from home or are the vanpool driver. Table 4 illustrates all means of how respondents travel to meet their vanpools.

TABLE 4: MEANS OF GETTING TO VANPOOL MEETING LOCATION

Access Mode to Vanpool	2006 Survey (n=1,019)	2002 Survey (n=816)
Drive alone	84.9%	83.2%
Leave from home/van driver	5.5%	6.9%
Dropped off at location	4.7%	4.3%
Carpool	2.8%	2.2%
Picked up at home	1.0%	2.1%
Other	1.1%	1.3%

The fact that a majority of vanpoolers drive alone to a central meeting point is significant to the calculation of the air quality impacts of vanpooling, because a large proportion of auto emissions are produced during the first few miles of a vehicle trip, when the engine is cold. Even though these trips tend to be short, these trips and the corresponding mileage are accounted for in the air quality evaluation.

Distance to Vanpool

As shown in Table 5, respondents travel an average of 7.2 miles to meet their vanpool, slightly higher than the 6.6 miles traveled in 2002.

TABLE 5: NUMBER OF MILES TO VANPOOL

Number of Miles	2006 Survey (n=985)	2002 Survey (n=728)
1 mile or less	13.2%	14.1%
1.1 mile - 2 miles	8.7%	9.0%
2.1 miles - 4 miles	19.8%	21.5%
4.1 miles - 6 miles	18.1%	18.0%
6.1 miles - 8 miles	13.0%	12.8%
8.1 miles - 10 miles	10.0%	9.6%
More than 10 miles	17.2%	15.0%
Mean =	7.2 miles	6.6 miles

Length of Time Vanpooling

When asked about the length of time commuting to work in a vanpool, respondents indicate they have been involved in a vanpool for an average of 34 months. In 2002, respondents reported involvement for 44 months. In addition, less than half of the respondents (49.4%) report vanpooling from more than one year. This is significantly lower than the 2002 survey findings, where the majority of respondents (72.9%) reported vanpooling for more than one year. The decrease in the average time vanpooling and the increase in the number of people vanpooling for less than one year is easily explained by the increase in the number of new vans operating in the region since 2002. Table 6 summarizes all the responses.

TABLE 6: LENGTH OF TIME VANPOOLING

Length of Time	2006 Survey (n=1,013)	2002 Survey (n=815)
1 – 12 months	50.6%	27.1%
13 – 24 months	17.7%	30.6%
25 – 36 months	6.3%	12.1%
37 – 48 months	4.3%	7.9%
49 – 60 months	6.6%	5.5%
More than 60 months	14.4%	16.8%
Mean =	34 months	44 months

Makeup of Vanpool

Vanpool riders report an average of 9.6 persons riding in each vanpool. The majority of vanpoolers (88.2%) ride in vans with eight to 15 people.

MODE CHANGES

Commute Mode Prior to Vanpooling

Respondents were asked what transportation they usually used to travel to work prior to joining a vanpool. The overwhelming majority of respondents stated their primary mode (use mode 3+ days/week) was driving alone (77.6%). Sixteen percent of respondents carpooled as their primary mode and 4.1% rode a bus or train. Almost 2.0% of respondents indicated they had always vanpooled.

FACTORS THAT INFLUENCED COMMUTERS TO JOIN A VANPOOL

The 2006 survey also asked respondents to review a list of items and indicate the ones that might have influenced them to join a vanpool. CTE developed the list based on input from ESOs and anecdotal evidence collected from Atlanta area residents during focus group interviews. The factors respondents selected most were gas savings (94.1%), reducing wear and tear on personal vehicle (88.9%), and reducing commute stress (72.9%). Slightly more than one-quarter of respondents (27.4%) mentioned financial assistance as an influencing factor. While financial

assistance received a lower percentage of responses relative to several other factors listed, the role incentives play should not be discounted. Subsequent questions in the survey point to the importance of incentives in commuters' decisions to both start and continue vanpooling. All responses are listed in Table 7.

TABLE 7: FACTORS INFLUENCING VANPOOL PARTICIPATION
(n = 1,018)

Factors*	Percent
Gas savings	94.1%
Reduce wear and tear on personal vehicle	88.9%
Reduce commute stress	72.9%
Time to sleep, read, work on way to work	43.7%
Environmental concerns	37.8%
Reduce cost to insure personal vehicle	30.6%
Financial assistance provided to vanpoolers	27.4%
Enjoy riding/traveling with others	27.0%
Use carpool/high occupancy vehicle lanes	25.5%
Friends/co-riders recommended vanpooling	25.5%
Time savings	23.4%
Other	4.4%

**multiple responses allowed*

INFORMATION OR SERVICES TO ASSIST IN FINDING OR FORMING A VANPOOL

More than half of the respondents (57.3%) said they had received assistance in finding or forming a vanpool. When asked about the type of assistance they received, most respondents indicated they received information from work or word of mouth (24.2%), closely followed by information in the form of ads, brochures, email, and/or flyers (23.8%). Other responses are included in Table 8.

TABLE 8: TYPE OF ASSISTANCE RECEIVED IN FINDING OR FORMING A VANPOOL
(n = 505)

Type of Assistance Received*	Percent
Received information from work, word of mouth	24.2%
Information: ads, brochures, email, flyers	23.8%
Received information from GRTA/partners	16.8%
Rider for the vanpool	16.0%
Telephone number, website	7.9%
Meetings or presentations on vanpool formation	6.3%
Didn't recall or no answer provided	3.6%
Other	2.4%
Did a search on-line	1.8%
Incentive – financial	1.2%

**multiple responses allowed*

When asked what organization(s) provided the assistance, respondents mentioned ESOs (36%), employers (33.8%), and vendors (26.1%) most frequently.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Commuters or Vanpools Receiving Financial Assistance

The survey also included questions about vanpool financial assistance. As shown in Table 9, more than half of the respondents said they or their vanpool received financial assistance for all or part of the vanpool operations.

TABLE 9: VANPOOLS RECEIVING FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR ALL OR PART OF VANPOOL OPERATIONS
(n = 1,011)

Receipt of Financial Assistance	Percent
Yes	59.7%
No	10.8%
Don't know	29.1%

Organizations Providing Financial Assistance

Respondents receiving financial assistance were asked what organization(s) provided the financial assistance. Almost half (41.8%) said they received assistance from an employer. Respondents also mentioned several other organizations, such as TMAs (20.7%), vanpool vendors (10.5%), GRTA (10.1%), government/DOT (7.6%), and The Clean Air Campaign (6.1%).

Use of Vanpool Prior to Receipt of Financial Assistance

When asked if they commuted in a vanpool before receiving financial assistance, more than half of the respondents (59.1%) said no. Only 10% of the respondents indicated they vanpooled prior to receiving financial assistance.

Importance of Financial Assistance in Decision to Vanpool

Financial assistance was important in the decision to vanpool for a vast majority of respondents, with two-thirds of respondents (65.9%) rating financial assistance as very important. Responses are included in Table 10.

TABLE 10: IMPORTANCE OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE IN DECISION TO VANPOOL

Importance	Percentage (n=690)
Very important	65.9%
Somewhat important	23.3%
Not at all important	10.7%

Alternate Transportation Mode if Vanpooling not an Option

The survey asked respondents how they would commute to work if vanpooling were not available. Respondents could provide more than one mode as an alternative to vanpooling. Twenty-seven percent of respondents noted they had two non-vanpooling commute options and another 8% said they had at least 3 non-vanpooling options. As shown in Table 11, more than 78.1% of the respondents stated they would drive alone, followed by 35.2% who would carpool and 21.7% who would take the bus or train. Almost 3% would not be able to make the trip at all.

TABLE 11: TRANSPORTATION MODE USED IF VANPOOLING WAS NOT AN OPTION

Mode	2006 Survey (n=1,003)
Drive Alone	78.1%
Carpool	35.2%
Ride a bus/train	21.7%
Bicycle/walk	0.5%
Telework	7.7%
Couldn't make trip to this location	2.5%
Other	0.6%

VANPOOL EXPERIENCE

At the request of the ESOs, CTE included a number of questions on the 2006 survey related to an individuals vanpool experience. CTE worked with the ESOs to develop the additional questions, and the survey responses are included in this section of the report.

Participation in Regional Incentive Program

The survey asked vanpool riders if they were aware of or participated in two of the regional incentive programs available to them— the New Rider Referral Program and Commuter Rewards. More than 78% of respondents were unaware of the New Rider Referral Program and less than 30% of vanpool riders participate in the region's Commuter Rewards incentive program.

When asked if they logged their commutes online, less than 32% of vanpool riders responded they did. However, of those vanpoolers participating in Commuter Rewards, 86% responded that they logged their commutes. Of all the vanpoolers who reported logging their commutes, 43.8% log daily, 29.4% log weekly, and 26.8% log occasionally. Commuters who did not log or logged occasionally were asked why they did not log more frequently. Half of the respondents stated they were unaware of the program, followed by 14% of respondents who stated someone else submits a log for them. This response likely indicates there is confusion between reporting submitted for NTD requirements and the regional incentive program reporting. Approximately 13% of the respondents stated they had no time to log and another 13% said they forget to log.

Other responses include web site confusing/not user friendly (3.1%), no reason (2.7%), log once per month (1.6%), no computer (1.0%), and no motivation/not a requirement (0.8%).

Vanpool Drivers

The survey asked the more than 550 respondents (54.6 %) who indicated that they were not a vanpool driver or back-up driver to review a list of items and select ones that would encourage them to do so. CTE developed the list with input from ESOs. Slightly more than one-quarter of respondents said nothing would encourage them to become a vanpool driver or back-up driver. The aided response selected the most by respondents was "If my vanpool needed a driver". Other factors noted by respondents are included in Table 12.

TABLE 12: THINGS THAT WOULD ENCOURAGE YOU TO BECOME A DRIVER OR BACK-UP DRIVER
(n = 332)

Things that would encourage*	Percent
If my vanpool needed a driver**	42.2%
If I rode for free as the driver**	29.2%
Nothing/not interested/not qualified	28.0%
If I could select the days I drive**	12.0%
If I could use the van for personal use**	9.9%
Other	5.4%
If met my requirements (morning, not evening, my hours)	2.1%
Other	2.4%
Concerned about liability	0.9%
My schedule is irregular	0.9%

**multiple responses allowed **aided responses listed on survey*

Challenging Factors

Learning more about the most challenging factors of vanpooling for vanpool riders was also of interest to ESOs. The most common responses selected by respondents were balancing rider needs/group dynamics (28.7%), recruiting back-up drivers (28.1%), juggling schedules (26.8%), obtaining new riders (26.7%), and retaining existing riders (19.7%). Other responses are included in Table 13.

Satisfaction with Assistance in Forming, Joining or Operating a Vanpool

Respondents were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with the assistance they received in forming, joining, or operating a vanpool from a TMA or The Clean Air Campaign. Slightly more than 40% of the respondents indicated they had not received assistance from a TMA or The Clean Air Campaign. Of the almost 60% who said they received assistance from a TMA or The Clean Air Campaign, nearly 75% indicated they were very satisfied with the assistance. All responses are included in Table 14.

TABLE 13: MOST CHALLENGING ASPECTS OF PARTICIPATING IN A VANPOOL
(n = 757)

Challenging Aspects *	Percent
Balancing rider needs (group dynamics)**	28.7%
Recruiting back-up drivers**	28.1%
Juggling schedules**	26.8%
Obtaining new riders**	26.7%
Retaining existing riders**	19.7%
Driving everyday**	10.8%
Maintaining the vehicle**	7.5%
Collecting fares**	5.4%
Too crowded, comfort/ac/heat	2.0%
No flexibility in schedule	2.0%
Leaving on time/riders not punctual	1.5%
Other	1.2%
No car during working hours	0.9%
Pickup point problems	0.9%
Arriving at work on time	0.8%
Driver problems	0.8%
Rising costs/financing	0.7%
Leaving too early	0.7%

** - multiple responses allowed **aided responses listed on survey*

TABLE 14: SATISFACTION WITH ASSISTANCE FROM TMA OR CAC
(n = 378)

Level of Satisfaction	Percent
Very satisfied	73.5%
Somewhat satisfied	20.4%
Somewhat dissatisfied	3.2%
Dissatisfied	2.9%

When asked why they were satisfied or dissatisfied, 288 respondents provided a reason. The majority of respondents were satisfied, saying the assistance was "helpful, responsive, supportive" (27.4%) and the " process was easy, successful" (23.3%). Respondents also mentioned satisfaction with "subsidies, drawings, saving money, and fuel cost" (21.9%). Slightly more than 10% of respondents noted dissatisfaction. Responses included dissatisfaction related to perceived lack of financial support, difficulties finding riders or forming a vanpool, a need for more/quicker information, and the impact on vans when adding new riders.

Satisfaction with Available Services

Respondents are generally satisfied with the services available to them. Respondents rated their satisfaction with services on a scale of one to five, where five meant extremely satisfied and one meant extremely dissatisfied. More than half of the respondents rated satisfaction as a four or

five for Ridematch List (52.5%), Vanpool Formation Meeting (50.5%), and Vanpool Incentive Programs (60%). Satisfaction at a four or five was slightly lower for Assistance Filling Empty Seats (45.2%), Vanpool Handbooks (43.4%), and Vanpool Materials (39%). Table 15 shows the level of satisfaction for each of the services included on the survey.

TABLE 15: SATISFACTION WITH SERVICES AVAILABLE AND USED

Service	1 Extremely Dissatisfied	2	3	4	5 Extremely Satisfied
Ridematch list (n=454)	10.9%	11.9%	25.3%	18.1%	34.4%
Assistance filling empty seats (n=407)	11.8%	9.3%	33.7%	17.7%	27.5%
Vanpool formation meetings (n=400)	11.8%	8.5%	29.3%	17.5%	33.0%
Vanpool incentive programs (n=450)	13.3%	7.3%	19.3%	21.8%	38.2%
Vanpool handbook (n=378)	13.5%	7.9%	35.2%	17.2%	26.2%
Vanpool materials (n=354)	15.5%	8.5%	37.0%	17.2%	21.8%

Other Services

When asked what other transportation services TMAs or CAC could provide, nearly one-third of respondents said no other services needed to be provided. Nearly one-quarter thought the organizations should provide more public transportation, buses, shuttles, or extended rail. Other responses are included in Table 16. It should be noted some of the responses are out of the direct control of the TMAs or CAC, such as more public transportation and van maintenance issues.

TABLE 16: OTHER TRANSPORTATION SERVICES FROM TMAS OR CAC
(n = 243)

Other Services*	Percent
Nothing, fine the way it is, can't think of anything	29.2%
More public transportation, buses, shuttles, extended rail	23.5%
Financial assistance, gas, parking fees, drawing	17.7%
More information: transportation, van availability, incentives, parking, riders looking for vans	12.3%
Van maintenance, cleaning, electric vehicle, comfort	5.3%
Access to car midday for errands or emergencies	4.1%
Other	9.1%

**multiple responses allowed*

Interest in Minivans

When asked if they would be interested in paying a higher monthly price to ride in seven-passenger minivans, nearly two-thirds of respondents (67.9%) noted they would not be interested in paying a higher monthly price to vanpool in a minivan. Only 8.2% of respondents expressed interest in this option and 23.9% responded they did not know if they would be interested.

Improving the Vanpool Experience

Respondents had the opportunity to provide comments on what would improve the vanpool experience for them. Approximately 350 respondents provided suggestions, with some providing multiple answers. It is difficult to draw conclusions from the comments because 10 or fewer respondents mentioned most topics. However, the suggestions do provide anecdotal evidence as to the issues that are of interest to vanpoolers responding to this survey. Suggestions for improvements are categorized below and include the topics of interest and the frequency of references.

Vans/Van Amenities

- More comfortable vans/seat comfort/headrests/seat belts/higher backs/more leg room (19)
- Van design (16)
- Limit number of riders per van for comfortable seating (12)
- Entertainment/internet access/more power sources (12)
- AC controls (6)
- Purchase more fuel efficient/hybrid/alternative fuel vehicles, push OEMs for development of these vehicles (4)
- Smaller vans (3)
- Need a newer van (3)
- Do not use alternative fuel vehicles (2)
- Use proposal process instead of low bid to ensure purchase of safest van (1)

Logistics

- Better proximity to meeting points/more secure locations/Park and Ride Lots (8)
- More flexibility in the hours of operation of vanpools (6)
- Parking passes for days when need to drive (3)
- Better drop-off/pick-up locations/closer to work location (4)
- Access to fleet cars/access to alternate transportation (2)
- Billing issues (2)
- Improve daily logs/rider logging/printed schedule of riders for drivers (2)
- Leave on time (2)
- GRH availability (1)
- Delete rules for minimum number of riders (1)
- More help identifying new riders (1)
- Consistent rules (1)
- Provide drivers with list of riders' scheduled days to ride the van (1)

Drivers

- Incentives for drivers and back-up drivers (12)
- Ensure there is a back-up driver/more drivers (8)
- Concern about safe driving (9)
- Driver should be more considerate of riders/riders' comfort (3)
- Better communication from driver (1)
- Hire drivers for the vans (1)

- Ensure drivers keep maintenance up-to-date (1)
- Forum for drivers/back-up drivers to share ideas (1)

Services Provided

- Improve web sites/ridematching for vanpools/outreach/provide contact information for vans (9)
- Provide consistent programs/all programs should be linked/provide information for all programs (5)
- Not satisfied with services provided (5)
- Satisfied with services provided (4)
- Keep staff costs down/eliminate collateral materials/prizes (4)
- Receive bills on time/information in a timely manner (2)
- More GRH options (2)
- Survey van riders regarding safety concerns (1)
- Better communication (10)
- Review schedule/routes for efficiency (1)
- Provide alternative routes to drivers to avoid traffic (1)

Costs

- Maintain price/lower price (7)
- Provide assistance with gas costs (4)
- Provide more financial support/financial support enables van to be successful/flat rates (4)
- Financial assistance through federal and state agencies for their employees (3)
- Ways to keep parking costs lower/assistance with parking costs (2)
- Better communication on changes to van costs (1)
- Consistent costs for all vanpools (some pay for gas/others do not) (2)
- Revise fare structure (2)
- Increase ceiling for gas costs as prices increase (1)

Dynamics

- Everyone should be on time/stricter rules about time (4)
- Establish guidelines for vanpooling/publish rules for etiquette (4)
- No perfume/no smoking before getting on van/no cell phones or radios/rotate seats/proper hygiene (4)
- More shared responsibilities among riders/more cooperation between riders/more courteous riders (4)
- Driver should not have complete control over the van (3)
- Limit cell phone use on van (1)
- Variety of radio stations (1)

Maintenance

- Keep vans clean/provide assistance in cleaning vans (17)
- No incentive for driver to clean van (1)
- Eliminate wasted staff time in vehicle swap time by spacing maintenance cycles (1)

Routes/Schedules

- More vans on same route/more flexible times (9)
- Need more routes (7)
- Closer meeting locations (2)
- Closer drop-off/pick-up sites (2)

Incentives

- More incentives for riders and drivers (11)
- More monthly logging rewards/more monthly contests/better notification of award programs (3)
- Allow driver to ride for free/enjoy quarterly luncheon for driver/back-up drivers (2)
- Why are vanpools not eligible for Cash for Commuters? (2)
- Lack of awareness of incentive programs others on van received (1)

Marketing/Promotion

- More promotion of vanpools/vanpools more viable option than transit (8)
- More information regarding incentives (1)
- Employers should give all new employees vanpool information (1)
- More government promotion of rideshare practices (1)

Employer

- Employers should be more supportive of vanpool programs/advertise/pay for parking (4)
- Employers should allow ESOs on-site more often (1)
- Employers should provide flex time because of vanpool schedules (1)
- Employers should set-up voucher system to reimburse employee's costs (1)
- Vanpoolers penalized for being late because van stops at multiple employers (1)
- Interested in 7-person minivan if employer subsidizes costs (1)

Other

- Expanded HOV lanes/transit service (5)
- Changing/would consider changing to express bus because it provides more flexibility (2)
- Change requirements for HOV lanes (1)
- Quit surveying (1)
- More government funding, better roads (1)
- Keep state agencies located around the capitol (1)
- GRTA would rather operate Xpress buses then vanpools (1)
- Wish GBA still operated the vans (1)
- Try to keep it going (1)
- More state patrolmen should make a presence on highway to help people slow down (1)
- Less traffic (1)
- Supply stamps (1)
- Transit system that provides better accessibility (1)
- Provisions for accommodating morbidly obese riders (1)

Follow-Up
Four respondents asked for follow-up on specific issues.

DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

Gender and Age

Slightly more than half of the respondents were female (55.9%). As shown in Table 17, 63% of the respondents were between 35 and 54 years old and 85.8% were between 35 and 64 years old.

TABLE 17: AGE GROUP
(n = 988)

Age Group	Percent
Under 25	0.9%
25-34	12.1%
35-44	26.5%
45-54	36.5%
55-64	22.8%
65 or older	1.1%

Ethnic Background

As shown in Table 18, Caucasians and African-Americans represent the two largest ethnic group categories of survey respondents, 64.9% and 28.5%, respectively.

TABLE 18: ETHNIC BACKGROUND
(n = 975)

Ethnic Background	Percent
Asian/Pacific Islander	1.8%
Caucasian/White	64.9%
African-American	28.5%
Native American	0.9%
Hispanic/Latino	1.7%
Other/Mixed	2.1%

Income

Table 19 provides a breakdown of respondents by household income categories. Slightly more than three-quarters of respondents have household incomes of $50,000 or more and about one-quarter have household incomes of $100,000 or more.

TABLE 19: HOUSEHOLD INCOME GROUP
(n = 863)

Household Income Group	Percent
Below $25,000	1.3%
From $25,000 to $49,999	21.9%
From $50,000 to $74,999	30.0%
From $75,000 to $99,999	22.4%
From $100,000 to $124,999	14.5%
From $125,000 to $149,999	5.6%
More than $150,000	4.4%

SECTION 4 IMPACTS OF COMMUTE CHANGES

One of the purposes of this survey is to collect the data necessary to calculate the travel and emissions reductions resulting from vanpool activities provided by ESOs and the four primary vanpool vendors serving the Atlanta region. The four impact measures necessary to calculate travel and air quality emissions reductions include:

- Placement rates and placements – Proportion and number of commuters who use vanpooling as a commute option

- Vehicle trip (VT) reduction – Daily number of vehicles removed from the road by commuters using vanpools

- Vehicle miles of travel (VMT) reduction – Daily number of miles that would have been traveled by the vehicles removed from the road by commuters who vanpool

- Emission reduction – Daily reductions in emissions of ozone precursors (VOC and NO_x) expressed in terms of tons per day reduced

PROGRAM IMPACT MEASURES

The daily travel and air quality emissions reductions achieved by the use of vanpools as a commute option are included in Table A. Typically, CTE reports impacts for a longer evaluation period (e.g., over the course of a year), however because CTE administered the vanpool survey early in the year, these impacts only include the contributions of those vanpooling at the time of the survey. The impacts are expected to increase by the end of the year due to the growth in vanpooling in the region. CTE will calculate annual impacts for 2006 vanpool activity in early 2007. The impacts presented in the report are also based on 2005 emission factors as the factors for 2006 are not yet available. When CTE prepares the annual calculation for 2006, the emission factors will be updated.

Commuter Placements and Placement Rates

CTE is not using the vanpool rider population used in the sample to determine the impacts from vanpool riders in the region The sample number of 3,168 is an overestimation of vanpool riders. Based on data from vendor records and results from the actual survey, an estimated 2,800 individuals commuted by vanpool at the time of the survey. This number is based on the actual ridership of 1,345 riders provided for 127 of the 277 vans operated by the four vendors. For the remaining 150 vans, ridership is estimated to be the average ridership of 9.7 riders per van as determined through the survey, which totals 1,455 riders. An estimate of 2,800 riders more accurately represents the true number of individuals vanpooling at the time of the survey because it is based on responses given in the survey and actual rider data provided by the vendors.

The new placement rate shown in Table 20 reflects the percent of commuters who started vanpooling during the year prior to the survey. The retained placement rate reflects the percent of commuters who started vanpooling more than one year prior to the survey.

Vehicle Trips and VMT Reduced

Vehicle trip reduction measures the number of vehicle trips no longer made as a result of commuters shifting to alternative modes. An examination of the travel behavior reported by survey respondents yields a vehicle trip reduction (VTR) factor of –1.42 daily one-way vehicle trips reduced per placement.

This factor, when multiplied by the number of placements in vanpools, equals a total daily vehicle trip reduction of 3,976 trips. Multiplying the number of vehicle trips reduced by the average commute distance for the respondents who vanpool results in a total daily vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction of 149,895 miles.

TABLE 20: VANPOOL RIDER PROGRAM IMPACT MEASURES

Impact Measure	Daily Impacts
Placement Rates	
- New vanpool placement rate	50.6%
- Retained vanpool placement rate	49.4%
Commuter Placements	
- New vanpool placements	1,417
- Retained vanpool placements	1,383
Daily Vehicle Trips Reduced	
- New vanpool placements	2,012
- Retained vanpool placements	1,964
Daily VMT Reduced	
- New vanpool placements	75,847
- Retained vanpool placements	74,048
Daily Emissions Reduced	
- NO_x (tons)	0.1167
- VOC (tons)	0.1396

Emissions Reduced

The calculation of emissions benefits, defined as tons of pollutants reduced, are calculated with a simplified method using regional emission factors provided by the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Protection Division. Thirteen counties in the metropolitan Atlanta region do not meet federal air quality standards for ozone. Reducing emissions of oxides of Nitrogen (NO_x) and Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) is of particular concern in the region as these pollutants are the primary components in the formation of ozone.

The 2005 emission factors are:

VOC = 1.011 grams per vehicle mile reduced
NO_x = 0.845 grams per vehicle mile reduced

These factors, when multiplied by the vehicle miles reduced and adjusted to account for the length of the drive to vanpool meeting points, equals:

- NOx 0.1167 tons per day reduced
- VOC 0.1396 tons per day reduced

} 0.2563 tons pollutants per day reduced

SECTION 5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS

Vanpooling is the only commute alternative option the majority of vanpool rider survey respondents would use. Slightly more than 78% replied they would drive alone to work if vanpooling was not available. In addition, the vanpoolers surveyed show a strong commitment to vanpooling. Nearly 95% of weekly commute trips for those surveyed are made in a vanpool, increasing from 85.3% of weekly commute trips in 2002. By vanpooling, the respondents reduce nearly 4,000 trips daily. The respondents also are long-time users of the mode. On average they began vanpooling nearly three years ago.

The nearly 150,000 daily vehicle miles reduced as a result of vanpool activity is particularly significant due to the lengths of the vanpoolers' commutes. On average, the one-way commute distance is 37.7 miles. The reduction in vehicle miles traveled result in significant daily air pollution emissions reductions, approximately 0.2563 tons per day for NO_x and VOC combined.

Financial incentives are an important component in prompting commuters to vanpool. More than one-half of the respondents participate in a vanpool that receives financial assistance for all or part of the vanpool operation. More than one-half also stated they did not vanpool prior to receiving the assistance.

Vanpoolers tend to be satisfied with their overall vanpool experience and the services provided. While many respondents provided suggestions on how to improve their vanpool experience, there was a not preponderance of support for any one issue or concern.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The survey findings clearly show the substantial contributions vanpoolers make in trip and vehicle miles reduced, and ultimately, emissions reductions for TDM programs within the Atlanta region. The survey findings also reveal a successful regional vanpool program and validate the importance of vanpooling in the region. Survey questions about the role incentives play in a commuter's choice to start or continue vanpooling show a positive correlation between the availability of incentives and the choice to vanpool. Responses to further questions regarding the overall vanpool experience also provide insight to vanpoolers' behavior and motivations. These findings suggest several actions the TDM community should take to maintain and even improve vanpooling successes in the region.

- The large number of vanpool riders who would switch back to driving alone if vanpooling was not available would have a substantial impact on vehicle miles traveled and air quality emissions reductions provided by TDM programs. **As such, the TDM community should continue to support new vanpool formation and maintenance of existing vanpools. Particular attention should be given to maintaining ridership on existing vans by providing assistance in replacing riders who leave vanpools and identifying riders for empty seats on existing vans**, as some vanpool riders cited obtaining new riders as a challenging aspect of participating in a vanpool.

- The nearly two-thirds of vanpool riders who said financial assistance was "very important" to their decision to start or continue to vanpool demonstrates a continued need to financially support vanpool programs in the region. More importantly, over half did not vanpool prior to receiving this assistance, signifying the power of incentives in encouraging participation. **GRTA should continue to focus on securing long-term 5307 finding for the regional vanpool program and CMAQ should continue to be used to the maximum extent possible within federal guidelines. ESOs wishing to use local funds to further subsidize vanpooling within the parameters of a regional program should work to identify sustainable funding resources. Other incentives not requiring direct funding that would help reduce costs of vanpooling, such as certain tax incentives, should also be explored.**

- The recent growth in vanpools across the region and the positive survey findings related to the financial assistance provided is a good indication that the portfolio of vanpool incentives provided by the TDM community is meeting the needs of vanpool riders. However, many vanpool riders did express concern with the ability to identify drivers and some suggested offering additional incentives to assist with vanpool driver recruitment. **The TDM community should consider making the driver incentive a routinely offered incentive and investigate the feasibility of additional incentives to encourage participants to become drivers or back-up drivers.**

- The low level of awareness among vanpool riders for Commuter Rewards and the Vanpool Incentive Program New Rider Referral illustrates a need to raise rider awareness of the various regional incentive programs available to them. The lack of awareness is also supported by vanpool rider suggestions to provide information for all programs and general lack of awareness of existing programs. **The TDM community should make a concerted effort to increase vanpool rider awareness and understanding of the various regional incentive programs available to them.**

- **When conveying the benefits of vanpooling to potential riders, gas savings, reduced wear and tear on a personal vehicle, and reduced commute stress should be part of the overall marketing and outreach message.** These benefits are the factors vanpool riders cited as top influences in their decision to vanpool and also validate focus group work completed by The Clean Air Campaign earlier this year.
- focus group work completed by The Clean Air Campaign earlier this year.

APPENDIX A FINAL SURVEY

Atlanta Region Vanpool Rider Survey

If you want to be entered into the prize drawing, please provide your name and phone number below.

Van/Rider ID#

Name (First and Last): _____

Work Phone Number: _____

1. During a typical week, how do you travel from home to work each day? Check only one type of transportation for each day. If you typically use more than one type on a single day, check the type you use for the longest portion (distance) of your trip. Check "Telework" if you would work all day during your regularly assigned work hours at home or another location that is closer to your home than is your usual work location (other than for an off-site meeting).

Type of Transportation	M	T	W	Th	F
Drive alone (including motorcycle/moped)	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Carpool (including with family/household member 16 or older)	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Vanpool (with co-workers or others who work nearby)	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Ride a bus (MARTA, C-Tran, CCT, GCT, Xpress)	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Ride a train/subway (MARTA)	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Bicycle/walk	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Telework (worked all day at home or other location)	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Compressed workweek day off	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Do not work (regular day off, sick, vacation, holiday)	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Other (specify) _____	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

2. How many people, including yourself, usually ride to work in your vanpool?

_____ number of people

3. How do you travel to where you meet your vanpool?

❑ Drive alone ❑ Bicycle ❑ Dropped off at location
❑ Ride a bus ❑ Leave from home ❑ Other (specify) _____
❑ Walk ❑ Picked up at home

4. How far do you travel to this meeting location? If you travel more than one mile, please indicate the number in miles.

❑ 1/4 mile or less ❑ 1/2 mile ❑ 3/4 mile ❑ 1 mile
❑ More than 1 mile (specify) _____ miles
❑ Not applicable (leave from home/picked up at home)

5. What is the total one-way distance (miles) from your home to your usual work location, including the distance to your vanpool meeting point? How long does it take you to make this trip?

_____ miles and _____ minutes

6. How long have you been commuting to work by vanpool? (Report as either months or years, as appropriate)

_____ years OR _____ months (if less than one year)

7. a) Before you started vanpooling, what type of transportation did you usually use to travel to work? (If you used more than one, check the one you used the most days per week)

❑ Drive alone ❑ Carpool ❑ Bus ❑ Telework
❑ Train ❑ Bicycle ❑ Walk ❑ Always vanpool

b) How many days a week did you usually use this type of transportation? _____

c) What other type(s) of transportation did you use to travel to work?

❑ Drive alone ❑ Carpool ❑ Bus ❑ Telework
❑ Train ❑ Bicycle ❑ Walk ❑ No other type

8. What factor(s) most influenced you to join a vanpool? (check all that apply)

❑ Reduce commute stress
❑ Time to sleep, read, work on way to work
❑ Use carpool/high occupancy vehicle lanes
❑ Time savings
❑ Gas savings
❑ Reduce wear and tear on personal vehicle
❑ Reduce cost to insure personal vehicle
❑ Enjoy riding/traveling with others
❑ Environmental concerns
❑ Financial assistance provided to vanpoolers
❑ Friends/co-riders recommended vanpooling
❑ Other (specify) _____

CONTINUE ON OTHER SIDE ...

9. **Did you receive any information or services to assist you in finding/forming a vanpool?** ❑ Yes ❑ No

If yes, what assistance did you receive?_____

What organization(s) provided the information or services?_____

10. **Do you or does your vanpool currently receive financial assistance for all or part of your vanpool expenses? (Financial assistance could include help with: cost of van lease, cost of insurance, gasoline expenses, maintenance costs, parking).**

❑ Yes ❑ No ❑ Don't know

If yes, what organization(s) provide the assistance? _____

If no or don't know, did you receive financial assistance in the past? ❑ Yes ❑ No ❑ Don't know

11. **Did you vanpool before this financial assistance was available?**

❑ Yes ❑ No ❑ No financial assistance

12. **How important was the financial assistance in your decision to start or continue vanpooling?**

❑ Not at all important ❑ Somewhat important ❑ Very important ❑ No financial assistance

13. **Are you aware of the New Rider Referral program where you could be eligible to receive a $50 reward for referring a friend or co-worker to start vanpooling?**

❑ Yes ❑ No

14. **Do you participate in the Commuter Rewards incentive program?** ❑ Yes ❑ No

15. **a) Do you log your commute online?** ❑ Yes (answer 15b) ❑ No (answer 15c)

b) If yes, how frequently do you log your commute? (check the one that best applies)

❑ Daily ❑ Weekly ❑ Occasionally (answer 15c)

c) If no or occasionally, list the reasons that you do not log more frequently. _____

_____

_____

16. **Are you a driver or back-up driver for your vanpool?** ❑ Yes ❑ No

If no, what would encourage you to become a driver or a back-up driver? (check all that apply)

❑ If I could use the van for personal use
❑ If my vanpool needed driver
❑ If I rode for free as the driver
❑ If I could select the days I drive
❑ Other (specify)_____

_____

17. **If vanpooling were not an option to you, how would you travel to work? (check all that apply)**

❑ Drive alone (including motorcycle/moped)
❑ Carpool (including with family/household member 16 or older)
❑ Ride a bus (MARTA, C-Tran, CCT, GCT, Xpress)
❑ Ride a train/subway (MARTA)
❑ Bicycle/walk
❑ Telework (work all day at home or other location)
❑ Would not be able to make the trip to this work location
❑ Other (specify)_____

18. **What are the most challenging factors of participating in a vanpool? (check all that apply)**

❑ Maintaining the vehicle
❑ Collecting fares
❑ Obtaining new riders
❑ Retaining existing riders
❑ Balancing rider needs (group dynamics)
❑ Recruiting back-up drivers
❑ Driving every day
❑ Juggling schedules
❑ Other: _____

19. **If you received assistance forming, joining, or operating your vanpool from your TMA or The Clean Air Campaign, were you satisfied with the assistance you received with your vanpool?**

❑ Very satisfied
❑ Somewhat satisfied
❑ Somewhat dissatisfied
❑ Dissatisfied
❑ Did not receive assistance

20. **Please explain briefly why you were satisfied or dissatisfied.** _____

_____

21. **For the services that are available to you and that you have used, please rate your level of satisfaction with the following, where 5 is being extremely satisfied and 1 is being extremely dissatisfied.**

___ Ridematch list (list of commuters from 1-87-RIDEFIND)
___ Assistance filling empty seats
___ Vanpool formation meetings
___ Vanpool incentive programs
___ Vanpool handbook
___ Marketing materials

CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE ...

22. **What other transportation services could your TMA or The Clean Air Campaign provide that would be helpful to you?**

_____

23. **If 7-passenger minivans were available, would you be interested in paying a higher monthly price to ride in a minivan?**

❑ Yes ❑ No ❑ Don't Know

24. **What is your home ZIP code?** _____ **What is your work ZIP code?** _____

25. **Which of the following groups includes your age?**

❑ Under 25 ❑ 35-44 ❑ 55-64
❑ 25-34 ❑ 45-54 ❑ 65 or older

26. **Are you:** ❑ Male ❑ Female

27. **Which of the following do you consider yourself to be:**

❑ Asian/Pacific Islander ❑ African American ❑ Hispanic/Latino
❑ Caucasian/White ❑ Native American ❑ Other/Mixed (specify)_____

28. **What is your current household income?**

❑ Below $25,000 ❑ From $75,000 to $99,999 ❑ More than $150,000
❑ From $25,000 to $49,999 ❑ From $100,000 to $124,999
❑ From $50,000 to $74,999 ❑ From $125,000 to $149,999

29. **Do you have any suggestions on how to improve your vanpool experience?** _____

Thank you for completing this survey. Please return your completed survey by mail in the postage paid envelope provided by this Friday. The information you provide will be kept completely confidential and will be used only to help improve programs to meet commuters' needs. If you have questions, please call 678-244-4152.